

### **Remarks**

Further and favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks, as well as the amendments and remarks set forth in the response filed April 6, 2009.

### **Claim Amendments**

The term “polyvalent metal salt having sufficient solubility” in claim 1 has been amended to recite “polyvalent metal salt selected from the group consisting of an aluminum-containing cross-linking agent, a polyvalent metal chloride, a polyvalent metal bromide, a polyvalent metal oxide, a polyvalent metal salt of an organic acid, a polyvalent metal salt of a silicate, an aluminum-and-magnesium-containing compound, and a combination of at least two kinds thereof”. Support for this amendment is found on page 14, line 4 to page 15, line 2 of Applicants’ specification.

The bactericidal agent of claim 1 has been limited to an “iodine-based bactericidal agent”. Support for this amendment is found on page 17, line 19 of Applicants’ specification.

Claim 1 has also been amended to incorporate sugar as a component of the preparation. Support for this amendment is found on page 18, lines 5-12 of Applicants’ specification.

Claim 10 has been cancelled, without prejudice or disclaimer, and new claim 16 has been added to the application.

### **Response to Advisory Action**

In the first paragraph on the Continuation Sheet attached to the Advisory Action, the Examiner states that it is unclear what is meant by the term “sufficient solubility”. As discussed above, this term has been removed from the claims in the present amendment. Additionally, “polyvalent metal salt” has been further defined based on the teachings of the specification.

In the second paragraph on the Continuation Sheet attached to the Advisory Action, the Examiner states that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph has been overcome. Applicants appreciate this indication.

In the third paragraph on the Continuation Sheet attached to the Advisory Action, the Examiner responds to Applicants' argument that glycerin is not a bactericidal agent. Specifically, the Examiner states that glycerin is known for being "particularly useful for killing non-spore bearing bacteria". This discussion is no longer applicable, as claim 1 has been amended to require an iodine-based bactericidal agent.

The Examiner further responds to Applicants' argument that the sugars used in the present invention are not surfactants. Specifically, the Examiner states that the limitations of the specification are not read into the claims, and that sucrose qualifies as a sugar, therefore meeting the limitations of the claims. However, as discussed above, Applicants' claims have been amended to require the presence of a sugar, and to particularly define the sugar based on the teachings of the specification.

**Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, as well as the amendments and remarks set forth in the response filed April 6, 2009, it is submitted that each of the grounds of rejection set forth by the Examiner has been overcome, and that the application is in condition for allowance. Such allowance is solicited.

If, after reviewing this Amendment, the Examiner feels there are any issues remaining which must be resolved before the application can be passed to issue, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone in order to resolve such issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Hidetoshi HAMAMOTO et al.

By: /Amy E. Schmid/  
2009.07.06 15:24:52 -04'00'  
Amy E. Schmid  
Registration No. 55,965  
Attorney for Applicants

AES/pth  
Washington, D.C. 20005-1503  
Telephone (202) 721-8200  
Facsimile (202) 721-8250  
July 6, 2009